Appendix I.

[Vide answer to question No. 469 asked by Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 168 supra.]

(i)

G.O. Ms. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932.

Read—the following papers:—

Memorandum No. 42681-1 C, L. & M., dated 23rd October 1931.

Memorandum No. 42681-2 C, L. & M., dated 23rd October 1931.

Order—Ms. No. 781, *L. & M., dated* 29*th February* 1932.

All presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipal councils are informed that Government consider that licence fees should not be levied on motor lorries not plying for hire, i.e., private lorries. The Government will however have no objection to a nominal fee of Rs. 5 per annum being levied by local bodies in respect of such lorries. All presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipal councils are accordingly requested to see that the maximum rate of licence fees levied on these vehicles does not exceed Rs. 5 per annum per lorry.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Chairmen of Municipal Councils.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.

(ii)

G.O. Ms. No. 1263, L. & M., dated 6th April 1932.

Read—the following paper:—

G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932.

Order—Ms. No. 1263, *L. & M., dated* 6*th April* 1932.

Some presidents of district boards have enquired as to what class of motor lorries should be treated as 'private lorries' for the purpose of issuing licences on payment of a nominal fee as directed in G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932. All presidents of district

24th January 1933]

boards are informed that the distinction intended by Government is between lorries plying for hire and those which do not so ply and that the lorries falling under the former category are those which must be granted a 'G' permit under rule 30 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules, 1923. If cases of evasion come to the notice of presidents of district boards, they should at once report the same to the District Magistrate concerned for necessary action.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Chairmen of Municipal Councils.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
,, all District Magistrates (with copies of G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932).
,, the Law (General) Department.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 475 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 173 supra.]

Name and description of the scheme.	Remarks.
1 Ghiriar project	Vide answer to question No. 618.
2 *Kallar project.*—This provided for the diversion of the Kallar stream which flows to the west by the construction of a tunnel and other connected works.	The project was not investigated in detail as it was found that the amount of water to be diverted was very small and the cost would be out of proportion to the possible increase in revenue and the work was not likely to be useful by way of famine relief. A combined Irrigation and Hydro-Electric scheme was considered later and dropped as it was not possible to effect a satisfactory settlement with the Travancore Darbar, and as there were other projects under consideration.
3 Project for the utilization of the surplus water of the Nambiyar by improving the Kovankulam anicut, the excavation of a channel therefrom and the construction of a new tank to be supplied by it to irrigate 2,000 acres. Estimated cost Rs. 1,87,000 and the anticipated return was Rs. 10,000.	The project was given up as the return was small and the water-supply precarious and as there were engineering difficulties.
4 *Parapar Scheme.*—This consisted in the diversion of Parapar and two other hill streams for improving irrigation facilities in the district at a cost of about Rs. 30,000.	The scheme was considered hopeless both on engineering and financial grounds.